



Roundtable on Sustainable Forests

A Partnership for the Future

MEETING SUMMARY

November 17, 2004 – Alexandria, VA

The Roundtable on Sustainable Forests (Roundtable) met on November 17, 2004, in Alexandria, Virginia. Presentations made at the meeting are available in the *Meeting and Workshop Summary* section of the Roundtable's website, www.sustainableforests.net.

Attachments to the meeting summary include:

- Attachment A. Meeting agenda
- Attachment B. Participant list
- Attachment C. Description of joint project among the Intertribal Timber Council, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and USDA Forest Service on forest health and sustainability on Tribal lands
- Attachment D. Southern Regional Forest Roundtable Fall Update
- Attachment E. Western Regional project proposal on cultural resources and indicators
- Attachment F. Western Forestry Leadership Coalition proposal for work in the Mississippi River basin
- Attachment G. Draft Roundtable work plan for fiscal year 2005

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Co-Chair Joel Holtrop, Deputy Chief for State and Private Forestry at the USDA Forest Service, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He began his opening remarks by referencing the Chinese proverb "*May you live in interesting times.*" He observed that the Roundtable is making a difference and having an influence in these interesting times, as it transitions to new leadership and new areas of emphasis.

During his international travel over the last year, Mr. Holtrop observed the common theme that much of the best natural resource work is being done at the community level. For this reason, he emphasized the need for the Roundtable, in its next phase of activity, to embrace activities at the community scale.

Mr. Holtrop also commented that, within the USDA Forest Service, there is a recognized need to be more seamless across Deputy areas in order to be more effective at broadening and deepening the commitment to sustainable development. He referenced a recent USDA Forest Service sustainable development retreat, at which participants learned more about what different parts of the USDA Forest Service are doing and shared ideas about how to proceed in a more integrated way.

Mr. Holtrop then acknowledged Jim Finley, Professor of Forest Resources, Pennsylvania State University, and Dick Brinker, Dean of the School of Forestry, Auburn University. Drs. Finley and Brinker represent the Sustainable Forest Partnership (SFP) and, Mr. Holtrop said, will share the Co-Chairmanship of the Roundtable with him. He also expressed great appreciation to the National Association of State Foresters, and Jerry Rose in particular, for his service as Co-Chair for the past

several years and for his assistance in the leadership transition. Mr. Holtrop invited the new Co-Chairs to share their thoughts and to discuss their shared role.

Dr. Finley explained that the SFP is a consortium of universities, along with the USDA Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) that came together in 1995 to work across the university system to advance the concept of sustainable forest management. He noted that the SFP would hold a conference in May 2005 to expand its efforts. He characterized the role of the SFP as that of a responsible tinkerer, trying to figure out how sustainable forest management works and what we as stakeholders can do now to ensure a quality future.

Dr. Brinker stated that the Roundtable provides a great venue for discussion and commented on the value of bringing people together from different natural resource professions to discuss what they are doing in regard to sustainable forest management and what they envision for the future. He commented that foresters feel like they have been practicing sustainable forest management all along. Dr. Brinker also noted that a new sustainable development task force at Auburn University has worked to expand the discussion on sustainability and has increased the involvement of students and faculty in related seminars. He expressed hope that the Roundtable could transfer its ideas to society at large, helping to make everyone more aware of sustainability.

LEADERSHIP TRANSITION

Mr. Holtrop led the discussion of the Roundtable leadership transition by acknowledging Jerry Rose. He reflected on his 20 years of knowing and working with Mr. Rose and said that he viewed Mr. Rose as a mentor and as someone who understands that getting things done requires working together and cultivating the desire to work together. Mr. Holtrop expressed appreciation for Mr. Rose's contributions to the Roundtable, the Society of American Foresters, and to American society as a whole. Following Mr. Holtrop's remarks, several Roundtable participants also expressed their gratitude for Mr. Rose's service to the Roundtable.

Mr. Rose observed that he would not have accomplished what he had without the people in the Roundtable doing their work and working together. He acknowledged John Fedkiw and his pathway model and commented on how Mr. Fedkiw's work had influenced his thinking about sustainability. Mr. Rose also spoke about his vision of a program for the nation's forests, something he viewed not as a regulatory framework, but as an enabling framework that would be based on voluntary programs, allowing people to do the good things they want to do on the land.

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES PROJECT

Jay West of Meridian Institute presented a status report on the Multiple Perspectives Project, highlighting the progress made since the last update at the May 2004 Roundtable meeting. Among the accomplishments were the formation of a proposal and paper Review Committee, identification of potential authors representing a broad cross section of interests, and identification of donors supporting the process. He noted that no proposals were received from Congress or Tribes.

Mr. West then invited participants on the Multiple Perspectives Review Committee to comment on the project. One participant added that there was a diversity of both organizations and ideas represented in the proposals. Another Committee member emphasized the papers will provide a good basis for the ongoing dialogue on sustainability.

Highlights of the discussion following the presentation included:

- In the request for proposals there was confusion regarding the level of emphasis in the papers on analyzing data and identifying data gaps, versus the objective of describing the story told by the *National Report on Sustainable Forests* and what that story says about sustainability in the U.S. It was clarified that the authors are likely to provide an academic style of review. They will not necessarily comment on the story told by the *National Report*; rather, they will focus on the data they saw in the report and why those data are or are not useful.
- Authors will not comment on whether or not the data show that conditions are sustainable. Further, because the report focuses on what we know now rather than on trends, authors are likely to discuss selected parts on report and on what we know right now.
- It was recommended that the Review Committee establish the date for the October 2005 Multiple Perspectives Workshop as soon as possible so that those interested can plan to attend. Also, in designing the workshop, consider following the presentation on each paper with a brief 10-minute presentation from a discussant that has similar or related experience to that represented in the paper. The presentation would consist of thoughtful comments on the paper, including comments on the highlights of the web dialogue.
- There are a lot of authors on the list who will provide perspectives on the *National Report* from the viewpoint of their scale of activity. They will then reference and correlate with the Montreal Process C&I.

In response to the concerns about the lack of Tribal participation in the Multiple Perspectives Project and for general information on efforts underway in the Tribal arena, Sarah Walen of Meridian Institute gave a brief update on a national scale project funded by USDA Forest Service and led by the Inter Tribal Timber Council (ITC) in coordination with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Attachment C is a copy of the project description.

Ms. Walen explained that the project will involve a study and assessment of forests on Tribal lands in order to better understand the concept of forest sustainability in Indian Country and to explore how the Montreal C&I might be adapted to Tribal forests and forestry. The first phase of the project will involve the production of an issue of *Evergreen Magazine* on Tribal perspectives on forest health and sustainability and efforts to engage Tribes in national and international collaborative forestry activities. The second phase will involve an assessment of the potential applicability of the Montreal C&I to reflect Tribal views on forest health and sustainability.

REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE INTEGRATION AND SYNTHESIS GROUP'S (ISG) WORKSHOP

Ted Heintz of the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) described the highlights of the workshop held the previous day, at which Roundtable participants were invited to provide feedback on the ISG's multi-tiered conceptual framework.¹ Workshop participants engaged in a discussion of how the ISG framework connects to the Montreal C&I and whether it might be used as a tool in the upcoming Montreal Process meetings concerning refinements to the C&I. Mr. Heintz explained that the framework is intended to serve as a basis for integrating and synthesizing criteria and indicators for forests, rangelands, minerals, and water resources. He also said that the framework is designed to be somewhat

¹ See http://roundtablenetwork.cnr.colostate.edu/Conceptual_Modeling_Info/Concedptual%20Model.htm for additional information on the ISG.

general and that the Montreal indicators would be a subset of the general states and processes described in the framework.

Tim Mealey of Meridian Institute, who has been facilitating the ISG, said that the ISG was formed by the Roundtable Network and is comprised of representatives from the four resource roundtables and the Heinz Center. More participation from the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests would be welcomed, and anyone interested should contact Meridian.

Mr. Mealey observed that the process of developing the conceptual framework is iterative and that the outcomes from the ISG Workshop represent a milestone in that iterative process. As the process evolves, it may contribute to related national-level work by the CEQ, Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). It may also contribute to the conversations on what U.S. stakeholders have to say about refinements to the Montreal Process indicators. This opportunity for input to the revision process is important and timely, as the U.S. Government is tasked with obtaining input for the U.S. delegations attending the Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting in October 2005 and the Montreal Process Working Group (MPWG) meeting in February 2006. Among the next steps for the ISG will be additional work on mapping the Montreal Process indicators to the framework to see what kind of issues emerge.

Key points in the discussion that followed Mr. Heintz's presentation included:

- In the international arena, it has always been the intention to improve the indicators. Success with their implementation and institutionalization in some countries has created reluctance to make major changes. Now we have an opportunity to take a fresh look at the indicators, informed by the results of the country reports. The conceptual framework, given its applicability to indicators from all resource areas, is a useful contribution as well.
- The scientists who have experience reporting on the Montreal Process indicators have a good grasp on potential refinements. We need to look ahead at how to integrate and inform the 10 million private land managers that make decisions about the majority of our country's forestland. Put the framework and what it means in a format that will be simple and understandable so that it will reach this group.
- The ISG effort may produce something useful to the USDA Forest Service's required reporting under the Resource Planning Act (RPA) and will be something that those responsible for the assessments would have an interest.
- It is critical to understand how the timelines for data collection in the RPA process, the next *National Report* process, and the indicator refinement process interact. If the intent is to have two seasons of data collection for the next *National Report* by 2009, autumn 2005 is the deadline for making decisions on the data to be collected. Field crews have to have data collection protocols by February 2006 for data collection in 2006 and 2007. The data would then be compiled, cleaned, and released for analysis in June 2008. Report preparation takes 18 months and would be complete in December 2009. The timeframe could be more generous if only one data collection season is necessary. It was noted that the U.S. delegation in Jasper agreed to reporting in 2009 or 2010, thus possibly allowing for 2 years of data collection.
- An important element missed in the discussion so far is the need for the U.S. to get to point where its environmental data is as trustworthy as its economic data. The Roundtable plays a key role in developing trust in the data. As the data are used, it is important to try and keep values separate from the data.

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SCIENCE FOR SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY'S (NCSSF) INTERIM FINDINGS

Chris Bernabo, NCSSF's Director, provided a report on the status of their First Findings Report, highlighting the progress made since the update he gave at the Roundtable's May 2004 meeting. Following some general background about NCSSF, the group heard about the content of the findings report including projects, findings, and areas of ongoing activities. The group also heard about areas of new work proposed by NCSSF, which emphasize applying NCSSF knowledge and the tools that have been developed as a result of their work to date. A copy of the First Findings Report will be available at www.ncssf.org on January 4, 2005, coincident with the USDA Forest Service Centennial.

Highlights from the ensuing discussion included the following:

- What is the premise for the work listed in the presentation as *Scientific Basis for Standards – East & West*? It was explained that in the West the focus was primarily on federal lands in the Pacific Northwest. In the East, the emphasis was on industrial private sector land. In general, the main focus is not on ownership, but on the set of practices imposed by corporate or organizational standards and attempting to evaluate whether the practices stand up to the best knowledge we have.
- In measuring the outcomes of certification consider the following: whether there are trends in resource and social conditions at the landscape level; aggregating the effect of certification on the landscape level; the value of measuring outcomes at this level if there is no way to create change on the landscape; and making links to the state, regional, and national C&I efforts.
- The idea of establishing a gold standard for research to provide managers with non-biased information is intriguing. How can you assure land managers that the Commissioners and reviewers listed on the NCSSF website are unbiased and fair? It was explained that a review panel is comprised of scientists and managers. Thus, grantee's products have to pass scrutiny from both perspectives. Finally, ultimate responsibility for any potential bias in a grant recipient's work lies with the Commission, and the Commission may not accept something if they think that it is biased or incomplete.
- The *National Report*, which represents an aggregated outcome of forest-related activities by 10 million private landowners, federal and state land managers, and others, is an example of using an objective or unbiased process. The challenge is how to extract from the *National Report* the diversity of desired conditions and to look at those as a reference point that reflects the interests of multiple stakeholders. With this reference point it would be possible to make value judgments about what is measured on the ground.

REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE LINKING COMMUNITIES TO THE MONTREAL PROCESS CRITERIA & INDICATORS – A TOOL KIT

Gerry Gray of American Forests gave a presentation entitled Linking Communities to the Montreal Process C&I. His presentation was followed by an overview by Don Outen, Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management, of one of three pilot projects included in Linking Communities project. Mr. Gray said that Linking Communities was a 3-year project designed to strengthen the understanding of the connections between local, regional, and national efforts to develop C&I for sustainable forests. The goals of the project were to:

- Engage communities in national discussions on the Montreal C&I;

- Advance the understanding of how to connect local, regional, and national C&I efforts through pilot projects; and
- Inform the *National Report* with information on community use of indicators.

The project included creating a national technical committee, preparing a tool kit for communities on the use of sustainability indicators, and conducting three pilot projects (Gogebic County, MI; Wallowa County, OR; and Baltimore County, MD). The tool kit manuscript, *Forest Sustainability Indicators Tools for Communities*, is available on the website of the Communities Committee of the 7th American Forest Congress at www.communitiescommittee.org/fsitool/ToolKit.pdf.

After Mr. Gray's presentation, Mr. Outen talked about forest sustainability in Baltimore County and his agency's experience with the Linking Communities project. Some of the highlights of his presentation included the history of growth and growth management in Baltimore County, land cover and resources, forest resources and fragmentation, and the strengths and weaknesses of local planning to address forest resource management. He then described how the County used the opportunity presented by the Linking Communities project to help develop and implement forest sustainability measures. He closed his presentation with the observation that planning in Baltimore County traditionally responded to development opportunities and pressures. As a result of their experience with Linking Communities, the County is at a point where it can take a serious look at natural resource planning and management as well.

Highlights of the discussion following these presentations include:

- The organizational capacity of an urban county is impressive relative to that of rural counties. In less dense areas, much more effort is necessary for travel, identifying and involving the right people, etc. It will be interesting to see how those sorts of factors influence the pilot projects.
- These presentations are good examples of ways to organize information in a way that reflects social values and can help to create change.
- The biggest challenge is that everyone sees a dysfunction, so it is necessary have each person explain why he or she sees a problem and to describe the kinds of change needed and the steps to make that change happen. It is also a challenge to keep people task-oriented and focused on the opportunity to fix things. People in Baltimore County are finally getting there and are starting to look at specific obstacles and options for fixing them.
- Be cautious about asking people to explore the applicability of C&I at the county level because the C&I were designed for application at the national level. Applying them at finer levels than they were intended could result in frustration.
- Local governments are still focused on development and water, and they are not yet interested in forest planning. Providing more opportunities like Linking Communities is important, in addition to informing others about experiences like that of Baltimore County. Most people in local government have not had the experience of working with a federal agency like USDA Forest Service, and they are not familiar with projects like the Local Unit Criteria & Indicator Development Project (LUCID) or Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA), or that any data are available at all.
- These types of efforts are more than exploring the use of indicators and developing a definition of sustainable forests. It is also essential to get buy-in. For example, in Gogebic County they got the entire county to sign off on the indicators.
- Funds are available for biodiversity planning at the state level. It might be worthwhile to make the connection between local planners and state wildlife agencies. Mr. Outen observed that the resulting discussions would focus on biodiversity and that in Maryland, the Chesapeake Bay Program, which

focuses on nutrient issues, diverted local momentum. Water quality concerns often consume the capacity of local governments, and all other issues are pushed aside.

- Were the challenges identified in the presentation on Linking Communities jointly developed? If so, there may be some implications for priority setting in the next few months related to C&I refinement. Mr. Gray responded that the challenges were largely identified from the national Technical Committee, which was established for the Linking Communities Project, but some also emerged in the different pilot projects.
- Appendix F of the Tool Kit does not include a comprehensive, balanced list of organizations in the forest sustainability area. This may be a politically sensitive issue that the authors may want to examine more closely. For example, the Forest Stewardship Initiative is mentioned, but the Sustainable Forestry Initiative and American Tree Farm are not.

UPDATES ON REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Southern Region

Jennifer Moore Myers, USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station, provided an update on regional and Tribal activities in South, following the Southern Roundtable on Sustainable Forests in November 2003 (Attachment D). The Southern Region moved forward with requests for proposals (RFP), which are focused on specific sub-regions and issues. The RFP was announced earlier in the summer of 2004, and the projects were awarded last month. The awards were granted at follows:

1. Sub-regional focus on the Southern Appalachians: Awarded to the Southern Appalachian Man and Biosphere Program and Land of Sky Regional Council. Their projects are seed money projects designed to engage stakeholders and to keep them engaged. The process involves a series of calls and meetings focused on identifying stakeholder concerns. The intent is to build consensus on the threats to sustainability and the opportunities to affect positive changes.
2. Issue-based: Awarded to the Southern Environmental Law Center, Environmental Defense, and the Southern Group of State Foresters. The project is focused on non-industrial private landowners and incentives for that group. There will be a focus group in each state, and an analysis group, which will identify themes from the focus groups, will then analyze the results from each focus group.
3. Tribal project: Awarded to the Eastern Band of Cherokee. The Southern Research Station is working with the Tribe on the specifics of the project, which will likely be tied to the Tribe's integrated resource planning efforts.

Ms. Moore Myers commented that no proposals were received concerning the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley. Future efforts in this region would potentially link with related activities in the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

A summary of the comments following Ms. Myers report included:

- There was no specific language in the RFP referencing the *National Report* or on developing indicators. However, it is understood that when each of these groups becomes engaged, they will need a framework for reporting. This phase of work is about the stakeholders and why they have or have not been involved in the past.
- There are many efforts in the Lower Mississippi that are looking at a variety of forest issues related to migratory birds. There may be some useful linkages to be made there.

- One of the criteria for the proposals was that there should be a broad, multi-scale group of folks participating in the project. Thus, groups like State foresters and State Conservation Planning Boards all had to be involved.

Northeastern Region

Susan Lacy, USDA Forest Service State and Private Forestry Northeastern Area, provide an overview of regional and Tribal activities in the Northeastern Area. She said that the Upper Mississippi Regional Roundtable was a great success and that a fulltime coordinator will lead work in that region. In addition, a significant portion of a grant focused on migratory birds would be applied to work in the Upper Mississippi. Regarding Tribal work in the Northeastern Area, Ms. Lacy said that the USDA Forest Service is working with the Great Lakes Indian Wildlife commission to identifying commonalities and differences between Tribal and non-Tribal notions of sustainable forests. Finally, in New England, State Foresters are looking at soil and water indicators and watershed project performance measures. They have identified 18 base indicators and are in the process of establishing a web-based indicator data clearinghouse in conjunction with a regional planning association.

Western Region

Sarah Walen, Meridian, provided the group with a brief update of ongoing Tribal and regional efforts in the Western Region. Ms. Walen reported that the USDA Forest Service recently began a project entitled *Development of Indicators for Sustainable Management of Cultural Resources on the Yakama Reservation* (Attachment E). One of the objectives of the project is to develop methods for describing the condition of Reservation lands managed for cultural resources using Montreal Process Criterion 6 Indicator 42 as an initial basis. The project will begin with an evaluation of available documentation on cultural resource values and decisions in the Yakama Nation's Forest Management Plan. Based on the research, qualitative field evaluations will be made to determine if forest management or other activities are affecting areas of cultural significance. The project will be completed in March 2006. The results of the study will be utilized to inform the Yakama Nation's forest management planning process and may be used on other Tribal lands and public lands where cultural resources are an important management consideration.

Ms. Walen also reported that the Western State and Private Forestry, Western Forestry Leadership Coalition (WFLC), the WFLC Sustainability Task Force had developed a proposal targeted at greater involvement by WFLS states in efforts aimed at improving water quality in the Mississippi River. Attachment F is the project proposal. As described in the proposal, WFLC members and staff would meet to explore how they could contribute to current efforts by the USDA Forest Service, State forest management agencies, and other groups.

The highlights of the comments following her presentation included:

- It is important for the Yakama Tribe to be cognizant of the scale at which Indicator 42 was developed in order to avoid frustration if all the pieces do not fit together.
- It might be helpful for the Roundtable to invite a presentation from Canada's Model Forest Program in order to learn more about the approach they have taken to securing long term funding, developing partnerships, and using a framework to build effective forest management.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ON ROUNDTABLE PLANS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Tim Mealey initiated the discussion on Roundtable plans for fiscal year 2005. He noted that the Roundtable sets its own priorities, which are described in the *Draft Description of Plans and Activities for Fiscal Year 2005* (Attachment G). The culminating event described in the document is the National Roundtable Workshop on May 11-13, 2005 in Denver, CO, at which the C&I refinement process will be a central focus. To provide the basis for more detailed discussion on how the proposed Roundtable activities could contribute to the C&I refinement process, Mr. Mealey turned to Rob Hendricks, USDA Forest Service, who would also serve as the USDA Forest Service's lead in the C&I refinement process.

Integration of the Montreal Process C&I Refinement Process

Mr. Hendricks gave a brief summary of a recent meeting of the Montreal Process Working Group (MPWG) on September 29, 2004, in Jasper, Alberta, Canada. At that meeting, the MPWG discussed and agreed on the timeframe for the timing of the next set of country reports and international indicator refinement process.

Regarding the next round of country reports, Mr. Hendricks said that many countries pushed aggressively for publishing the next set of country reports in 2008, which aligns well with the next World Forest Congress. Others said that for the C&I reports to be meaningful, they had to be aligned with the periodic reporting activities that each country relies on to generate new data. The consensus among countries was to produce the next round of country reports in 2009 or 2010.

Regarding the Montreal indicator refinements, Mr. Hendricks said that there were concerns about the potential cost of organizing both national and international meetings on each of the criteria. It was decided that each country should go through its own public involvement process, and each country committed to submitting a preliminary list of suggested refinements in June 2005, including the written language and rationale. The Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) would consider the country reports and make a proposal for refinements to the MPWG in February 2006. Furthermore, it was noted that Korea and four Canadian Provinces have incorporated the Montreal C&I into legislation, while countries like Chile and Argentina are managing their forests for carbon credits in anticipation of a global carbon market. Based on these realities, the participants at the Alberta meeting recognized that it would not necessarily be prudent or constructive to engage in substantial modifications, although some changes could certainly add clarity and improve understanding where some of the indicators are concerned.

Mr. Hendricks outlined some preliminary thinking for the schedule of domestic events that would help inform the U.S. perspective in the international C&I refinement dialogue. Elements of the schedule included:

- January 2005 – Workshop to validate that the criteria reflect forest-related values held by the broad forest stakeholder community.
- February through April 2005 – Three technical workshops to develop suggestions for changes to the indicators. Participants would come from a broad range of organizations and would include assessment practitioners and subject matter experts.
- May 2005 – Presentation to the Roundtable at the May National Roundtable Workshop on the results of the process with opportunity for some feedback.
- June 2005 – Tentative U.S. list of revisions and rationale statements for suggestions submitted to the TAC.

- August 2005 – Stakeholder group would recommend U.S. participants to the TAC meeting on indicator refinements.
- September/October 2005 – U.S. delegation attends the TAC meeting in Russia.
- December 2005 – Results of the TAC meeting sent to domestic participants in the refinements process.
- February 2006 – U.S. delegation attends 18th MPWG meeting in Japan to negotiate the final list of indicator refinements.

The following points were raised in the discussion that followed Mr. Hendricks' presentation:

- Some of the Montreal Process countries, like Australia and Canada, are way ahead in their application of the C&I, and the U.S. is helping others who need technical assistance. However, no one country wants to move too far in front of the others; they want to continue to move along together.
- There is a need to renew the Memorandum of Understanding between the federal agencies in order to preserve their data-sharing relationships and make reporting easier the next time.
- At the 2005 TAC meeting in Russia, what is the decision making process: one country one vote? Mr. Hendricks explained that the atmosphere within TAC is collegial. Ideas are discussed and their merits weighed to arrive at the best idea. In contrast, the MPWG meeting is political. There is one chair for each country delegation, and all of the other members of the delegation observe.
- It is unclear how the Roundtable would participate in the process of public input to the revision process. One idea that previously had support was to create a planning team, similar to those created for the regional workshops in 2003. The planning team would make proposals to the Roundtable Co-Chairs regarding how best to involve the Roundtable.
- The USDA Forest Service has spent a great deal of time and money developing and supporting the Roundtable. Those of us participating in the Roundtable have responded in kind with time and money. It is therefore important for the Roundtable to own the public input process while recognizing its responsibility to USDA Forest Service, which will report the results to the world.
- There is a difference between ownership and leadership. The ownership is clear, and we should not be afraid of using the word leadership. We often want to have government lead by facilitation. The concept of forming a planning team is good. Holding technical workshops in different locations across the country is good. Relying on the individuals who have 'been to the mat' on C&I and others from the academic community is good. Use a website to get comments from the broader public.
- By the end December, the RPA framework needs to be decided and the funding to do studies must be in place. The refinement schedule needs to recognize both the legal requirements of the Agency to do the RPA and the Montreal Process, not just the latter.
- A key aspect of an effective refinement process will be identifying the right technical experts. A good model to follow is the series of C&I Technical Workshops sponsored by the Roundtable in 2000. Four potential groups to draw from include: 1) authors who worked on the *National Report*; 2) individuals that attended the National Review Workshops in 2002 who identified issues that were not addressed; 3) people involved in the ISG conceptual modeling effort; and 4) individuals from the other roundtables who have re-thought these indicators.
- The intent of the proposed January 2005 meeting is to engage stakeholders to take ownership of the framework. However, it is not envisioned as an open discussion on the technical aspects of the indicators by people who are not engaged with the indicators intimately. The general public would be better engaged in a discussion of what the *National Report* means and what things could be done

better. The May Workshop would provide a better venue for broader input on the results of the series of technical workshops proposed for the February–April 2005 timeframe.

- Part of the refinement process needs to address how to improve the “So what?” value of the *National Report*. How can it be used to do jobs of folks on the ground better?
- Accept the scheduling necessary to get the job done. Also, it is important to recognize the values versus technical feedback needs. We know the people that need to be involved in the discussion and we do not need to invent anything new here.

Based on this discussion, Tim Mealey proposed that a set of volunteers from the Roundtable come together as a planning team to help ensure that the Roundtable is an integral contributor to the success of the refinements process. Driving themes for this group to consider are: the potential need for technical corrections to the indicators based on the problems identified by the authors of the *National Report*; determining the proper role for input from the ISG; and whether and how the issue of scale, which has been a consistent theme in domestic discussions of C&I, would be addressed in the refinement process. Reactions to the proposal included:

- The proposal is fine, with the exception of emphasizing scale. Focus instead on engaging experienced practitioners who have used and struggled with data, not just on scale. Not everything needs to be scalable from local to national.
- Drop the idea for a January stakeholder meeting. The planning horizon is too short, and the purpose of the meeting is ambiguous.
- This proposal covers too much. The USDA Forest Service should get its house in order first with regard to the timing and needs of the RPA as it relates to the next *National Report*.
- The themes proposed are good. Add the need to take a particularly close look at Criteria 6 and 7. It is also important to involve the right experts to benefit from recent research.
- Add a fourth theme of harmonization. There is a potential to create confusion where different groups have similar indicators but they report on them differently (e.g., Heinz Center).
- The discussion of whether the criteria still reflect values related to forests is relevant and different from technical inputs. One potential resource for the discussion on values is the cultural survey done by Debra Shields as part of her work on the Rangeland Roundtable.

Volunteers for the planning team included: Al Abee, USDA Forest Service; Keith Argow, National Woodland Owners Association; Nadine Block, American Forest & Paper Association; Michael Buck, National Association of State Foresters; Jim Finley, Sustainable Forestry Partnership; Rob Hendricks, USDA Forest Service; Eric Norland, USDA Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service; Wendy Sanders, Great Lakes Forest Alliance; and Sarah Walen, Meridian.

Meridian will also coordinate a call between Michael Buck, Wendy Sanders, and Chris Bernabo to share ideas about how to improve the *National Report*, the potential value of exploring the Canadian Model Forests for insights in the U.S., and to look for ways for the Roundtable to better coordinate with NCSSF.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE ROUNDTABLE AND CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Holtrop thanked everyone for productive discussion on the day’s topics and particularly on the C&I refinement process. He acknowledged that the refinements process is a substantial commitment and he

appreciated Roundtable support for helping to organize domestic feedback into that process. Mr. Holtrop said that he looks forward to hearing more about regional and Tribal activities at future Roundtable events and to hearing more about the progress of the ISG.

Dick Brinker commented that the Roundtable meeting was like a faculty meeting, where there is little control over what is done, and none over what is said. He appreciates the role the Roundtable plays and the work groups that contribute to it. He said that reaching out to private land owners would be a valuable investment in time in this next phase of activity and that it is important to have Roundtable activities coordinate with groups like NCSSF in order to reach private landowners more effectively.

ATTACHMENT A. MEETING AGENDA

Meeting Objectives:

1. Acknowledge and honor Roundtable leadership transition.
2. Learn about progress and provide input on ongoing Roundtable and other related efforts.
3. Solidify plans for Roundtable activities in FY-2005.

Wednesday, November 17, 2004

- 8:30 – 9:00 a.m. **Registration and Coffee**
- 9:00 – 9:30 a.m. **Welcome and Opening Remarks**
Joel Holtrop, USDA Forest Service, with Jim Finley and Richard Brinker, Sustainable Forestry Partnership, Roundtable Co-Chairs
- 9:30 - 9:40 a.m. **Agenda Review**
Tim Mealey, Meridian Institute
- 9:40 – 10:00 a.m. **Leadership Transition**
Acknowledgement of Jerry Rose's service and transition to the new shared leadership – Joel Holtrop and others
- 10:00 – 10:15 a.m. **Break**
- 10:15 – 10:45 a.m. **Progress Report on the Multiple Perspectives Process**
Jay West, Meridian Institute, and others on the Committee
- 10:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Report and Discussion on the Integration and Synthesis Group's (ISG) Workshop**
Ted Heintz, White House Council on Environmental Quality
- 12:30 – 1:30 p.m. **Lunch**
- 1:30 – 2:15 p.m. **Report and Discussion on the Linking Communities to the Montreal Process Criteria & Indicators – A Tool Kit**
Gerry Gray, American Forests and Don Outen, Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection & Resource Management, County Partners
- 2:15 – 2:45 p.m. **Update and Discussion on the National Commission on Science for Sustainable Forestry Interim Findings Report**
Chris Bernabo, Program Director, National Commission on Science of Sustainable Forestry
- 2:45 – 3:00 p.m. **Break**
- 3:00 – 4:30p.m. **Presentation and Discussion on Roundtable Plans for Fiscal Year 2005**
Tim Mealey, Meridian Institute
- Refinements to the Montreal Process Criteria & Indicators
 - Multiple perspectives
 - Integration and Synthesis Group

- United Nations Forum on Forests Proposals for Action
- Ongoing Regional and Tribal Efforts

4:30 – 5:00 p.m. **Next Steps for the Roundtable and Closing Remarks**
Joel Holtrop, USDA Forest Service, Jim Finley and Richard Brinker, Sustainable Forestry Partnership, Roundtable Co-Chairs

5:00 p.m. **Adjourn**

ATTACHMENT B. PARTICIPANT LISTS

NOVEMBER 17 ROUNDTABLE MEETING

Albert Abee
National Coordinator Sustainable
Development
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20250
phone number: 202-205-1720
fax number: 202-205-1012
aabee@fs.fed.us

Paul Anderson
Strategic Planning Analyst
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1621 North Kent Street
Arlington, VA 22209
phone number: 703-605-4475
fax number: 703-605-4199
ptanderson@fs.fed.us

Keith Argow
President
National Woodland Owners
Association
374 Maple Avenue East, Suite 310
Vienna, VA 22180
phone number: 703-255-2700
fax number: 703-281-9200
argow@cs.net

Chris Bernabo
Program Director
National Commission on Science of
Sustainable Forestry
14901 West Auburn Road
Accokeek, MD 20607
phone number: 301-292-8021
fax number: 301-292-8021
chris@ncssf.org

Nadine Block
Manager, Forest Policy
American Forest & Paper
Association
1111 19th Street NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
phone number: 202-463-2753
fax number: 202-463-2708
nadine_block@afandpa.org

Richard Brinker
Dean
School of Forestry
Auburn University
108 M. White Smith Hall
Auburn University, AL 36849
phone number: 334-844-1007
fax number: 334-844-1084
brinker@forestry.auburn.edu

Michael Buck
Sustainable Forestry
Representative
National Association of State
Foresters
41-665 Kumuhau Street
Waimanalo, HI 96795
phone number: 808-259-8946
fax number: 808-259-8946
mbuck@hawaii.rr.com

Graham Bullock
Masters of Public Policy
Candidate
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
2 Ware Street, Room 507
Cambridge, MA 02138
phone number: 857-204-4870
graham_bullock@ksg05.harvard
.edu

Jim Finley
Professor of Forest Resources
Sustainable Forestry Partnership
Pennsylvania State University
7 Ferguson Building
University Park, PA 16802
phone number: 814-863-0401
fax number: 814-865-6275
jfinley@psu.edu

Paul Geissler
Statistician
U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. Department of the Interior
12100 Beech Forest Road
Laurel, MD 20708
phone number: 301-497-5780
fax number: 301-497-5784
paul_geissler@usgs.gov

Gerry Gray
Vice President for Policy
American Forests
734 15th Street NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
phone number: 202-737-1944
fax number: 202-737-2457
ggray@amfor.org

Rich Guldin
Coordinator, IUFRO Science-Policy
Interface Task Force
USDA Forest Service, Research and
Development
1601 North Kent Street
4th floor, RP-C, SPPII Staff
Arlington, VA 22209
phone number: 703-605-4177
fax number: 703-605-5131
rguldin@fs.fed.us

Bill Hay
Chief Executive Officer
Forest Service, T.E.A.M.S.
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592
phone number: 707-246-7468
fax number: 707-562-9034
bhay@fs.fed.us

Theodore Heintz
Indicator Coordinator
White House Council on
Environmental Quality
722 Jackson Place NW
Washington, DC 20503
phone number: 202-456-6541
fax number: 202-456-6546
theodore_heintz@ceq.eop.gov

Anne Heissenbuttel
Executive Director
National Association of State
Foresters
444 North Capitol Street NW
Suite 540
Washington, DC 20001
phone number: 202-624-5415
fax number: 202-624-5407
aheissenbuttel@stateforesters.org

Robert Hendricks
Senior Policy Analyst
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 96538
Washington, DC 20090
phone number: 202-273-4730
fax number: 202-273-4750
rhendricks@fs.fed.us

Mike Higgs
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
PO Box 96090
Washington, DC 20090
phone number: 202-205-1382
fax number: 202-205-1271
mhiggs@fs.fed.us

Thomas Hoekstra
Assistant Director, Assessment and
Analysis
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1621 North Kent Street
Arlington, VA 22209
phone number: 703-605-4484
fax number: 970-295-5885
thoekstra@fs.fed.us

Joel Holtrop
Deputy Chief for State and Private
Forestry
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 96090
Washington, DC 20090
phone number: 202-205-1657
fax number: 202-205-1174
jholtrop@fs.fed.us

Jim James
Director, Environmental Affairs and
Sustainable Forestry
Weyerhaeuser
PO Box 9777
Mailstop CH2D23
Federal Way, WA 98063
phone number: 253-924-5848
fax number: 253-924-3866
jim.jamessustainableforestry@weye
rhaeuser.com

Brian Kernohan
Ecosystem Ecologist
Boise
1111 West Jefferson Street
PO Box 50
Boise, ID 83728
phone number: 208-384-7277
fax number: 208-384-7699
BrianKernohan@BC.com

Susan Lacy
Assistant Director, Northeastern
Area
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
11 Campus Boulevard, Suite
200
Newton Square, PA 19073
phone number: 610-557-4134
fax number: 610-557-4177
slacy@fs.fed.us

Aaron Lien
National Commission on
Science of Sustainable Forestry
1707 H Street NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
phone number: 202-530-5810
fax number:
alien@ncssf.org

Jennifer Moore Myers
Resource Information Specialist
Forest Service - SRS
U.S. Department of Agriculture
920 Main Campus Drive, Suite
300
Raleigh, NC 27606
phone number: 919-515-9497
fax number: 919-513-2978
jmooremyers@fs.fed.us

Eric Norland
National Program Leader, Forest
Biology
Cooperative State Research,
Education and Extension
Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue SW
MS 2210
Washington, DC 20250
phone number: 202-401-5971
fax number: 202-401-1706
enorland@recusda.gov

Donald Outen
Natural Resource Manager
Baltimore County Department of
Environmental Protection and
Resource Management
State of Maryland
401 Bosley Avenue
Towson, MD 21204
phone number: 410-887-4488 x 238
fax number: 410-887-3510
douten@co.ba.md.us

Christy Pereira
Program Specialist, Natural Resources
and Environment
Cooperative State Research,
Education, and Extension Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Ave SW
Mail Stop 2201
Washington, DC 20250-2210
phone number: 202-401-6444
fax number: 202-401-1706
cpereira@csrees.usda.gov

Dave Radloff
Special Assistant, Sustainable
Development
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue SW
Stop Code 1109
Washington, DC 20250
phone number: 202-205-1369
fax number: 202-205-1174
dradloff@fs.fed.us

Gerald Rose
Forest Sustainable Representative
National Association of State
Foresters
10279 County 426 E Road
Cornell, MI 49818
phone number: 906-384-6923
fax number: 906-384-6533
jerryrose@uplogon.com

Wendy Sanders
Director
Great Lakes Forest Alliance
PO Box 722
Hayward, WI 54843
phone number: 715-634-2006
fax number: 715-634-2006
forestls@lsfa.org

Laurie Schoonhoven
Project Coordinator
Sustainable Forestry Partnership
Penn State University
7 Ferguson Building
University Park, PA 16802
phone number: 814-865-7932
fax number: 814-865-6275
sfpinfo@psu.edu

Debra Whitall
Collaboration/Policy Analyst
Forest Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Avenue SW
Mailsop 1131
Washington, DC 20250
phone number: 202-205-0967
fax number: 202-205-1074
dwhitall@fs.fed.us

Robert Willis
Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
4401 North Fairfax Drive
Suite 400
Arlington, VA 22203
phone number: 703-358-2183
fax number: 703-358-1869
robert_willis@fws.gov

FACILITATION STAFF

Tim Mealey
Senior Partner
Meridian Institute
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20005
phone number: 202-354-6454
fax number: 202-354-6441
e-mail: tmealey@merid.org

Sarah Walen
Senior Mediator
Meridian Institute
P.O. Box 1829
Dillon, CO 80435
phone number: 970-513-8340 x 221
fax number: 970-513-8348
e-mail: skwalen@merid.org

Jay West
Mediator
Meridian Institute
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20005
phone number: 202-354-6453
fax number: 202-354-6441
e-mail: jwest@merid.org

Shawn Walker
Project Coordinator
Meridian Institute
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20005
phone number: 202-354-6450
fax number: 202-354-6441
e-mail: shawnwalker@merid.org

ATTACHMENT C. PROJECT DESCRIPTION ITC/BIA/USDA FOREST SERVICE FOREST HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY

INTRODUCTION

Through its Office of Tribal Relations, the USDA Forest Service made available funds totaling \$100,000 in June 2004 to assist the Intertribal Timber Council (ITC) and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in designing and implementing an effort to further define forest sustainability in Indian Country by evaluating the possibility of adapting the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators to tribal forests and forestry. USDA Forest Service contracted the Meridian Institute to administer the funds and facilitate a planning Task Force comprised of representatives from ITC, BIA, and USDA Forest Service, to plan the scope of the effort. The project, which will be completed by December 2005, provides an opportunity for shared learning by ITC, the Tribes involved, Evergreen Magazine readers, the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests and USDA Forest Service.

Contributing Factors in the Scoping Process

In the course of designing this project, the planning Task Force learned about ITC's previous use of the Evergreen publication on Forestry in Indian Country (1998) as an effective way to inform critical audiences about forest practices on Tribal lands. The USDA Forest Service funding comes at a time when a variety of Tribal forest related efforts have progressed to a point where ITC sees a unique opportunity to publish a second issue of Evergreen Magazine targeting a similar broad audience to further the understanding and promote additional thought and discussion on these and other related issues. They have determined that publishing these learnings in the Evergreen Magazine is the best way to reach interested and affected audiences across the United States to further the understanding of forest sustainability in Indian Country. Initial input from ITC suggests that Tribal manuscripts would address a spectrum of tribal views of forest health and sustainability as well as a manuscript on assessing the potential applicability of the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators on Tribal lands. Additional details on how the Evergreen publication will meet USDA Forest Service and Tribal interests in this scope of activities are presented in the following sections.

Representatives of ITC are aware of USDA Forest Service's interest in applying some of these resources directly to Tribes involved in forest management. However, Tribes were not reimbursed for the research and time that went into producing the articles for the 1998 publication, and ITC has no desire to set a precedent of paying Tribes for such professional contributions. They feel that, within the scope of this effort, the resources will better achieve the interests of Tribes and USDA Forest Service if applied to reaching critical audiences with the Evergreen publication. In keeping, ITC would also not plan to reimburse the other contributing author, Catherine Mater, Mater Engineering, who will perform the assessment of applicability of the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators.

Following is a summary of the scope of activities and associated cost allocation for each phase of activity.

SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED FOREST HEALTH AND SUSTAINABILITY PROJECT

Objective – Is to develop a project that would satisfy USFS interests addressing the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators while providing a mechanism for informing the public about tribal views of forest health/sustainability and results of the IFMAT-II assessment.

Task I - Developing a Set of Manuscripts

The model followed in the previous issue of Evergreen Magazine on Indian forestry would be employed. The ITC Operations Committee, Jim Peterson, and representatives of the USDA Forest Service would

identify topics of interest and value to address issues of forest health and sustainability from the perspective of Indian tribes and efforts to engage indigenous people in international collaborative forestry activities. A general solicitation of conceptual outlines for formal papers on identified topics as well as an open invitation on the general subject would be sent to the tribal community, IFMAT-II, Catherine Mater, and others identified during the scoping process. Conceptual proposals would be reviewed and selected by the Operations Committee, Jim Peterson of Evergreen Magazine and representatives of the USDA Forest Service. If needed, papers targeted on specific topics would be invited from identified individuals. Based on the experience with the 1998 issue, the number of Tribal manuscripts might be between 10 and 12. A preliminary estimate for the level of in-kind effort to research and produce the manuscripts is \$4,000 for each manuscript.

Task II - Assessment of the Applicability of Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators

Catherine Mater, Mater Engineering, would be tasked with producing an assessment of the potential applicability of the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators to reflect tribal views on forest health and sustainability, using as principal source materials: the manuscripts developed for the Evergreen issue; a selected set of forest/integrated resource management plans, and periodic reports produced by the BIA (e.g., Status of forest inventory and management plans, needs assessments, and annual reports); information collected on third party forest certification from IFMAT-II and subsequent certification efforts by tribes; available information from the three regional Tribal efforts.

The assessment would focus on:

- a. The suitability of the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators to adequately reflect tribal views of forest health and sustainability;
- b. The potential value of reporting information on the status of Indian forests separately from public and private lands; and
- c. The required modifications to existing BIA and tribal reporting systems to contribute information for use by the USDA Forest Service when addressing the status of sustainable forestry in the United States.

Catherine Mater indicated that, based what she knows about this project, a baseline estimate for her in-kind labor would be around \$6,000 – possibly more depending on additional details on the requirements of the project. Again, depending on the scale of effort, she would consider providing her services as in-kind.

Task III – Producing and Distributing Evergreen Magazine

Jim Peterson indicated that the budget for each project is developed based on the time expenses required to produce the issue. Costs include time for travel to do the research, research, writing, graphics and design, editing, production and distribution. The cost of publication is also dependant on the length of the issue, and the number of issues produced and mailed.

Mr. Peterson recalled that the total cost for the 1998 Evergreen issue was approximately \$101,000. The issue was 51 pages long, included approximately 50 photos, 25 graphs/maps, and 14 manuscripts. Jim Peterson wrote 2 of the articles totaling 18 pages, other articles generally ranged from 1 - 6 pages long. Information about the total number of issues is unclear at this time.

Mr. Peterson indicated that, to provide an estimate for the next issue of Evergreen, he would need to know: which and how many Tribes need to be visited (to estimate travel costs), how many articles, length of articles, length of issue, number of issues to be sent to whom, mailing information, number of photos and graphs.

Deliverable - The final report for the project would consist of an issue of Evergreen Magazine dedicated to healthy forests and sustainability from the perspective of Indian tribes. The issue, to be completed by

December 2005, would consist of the following elements:

The Indian connection to land: it's different than what you think

- How Indians view forest sustainability
- How Indians view forest health and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act
- Sustaining tribal cultures: foods, medicines, artistic expression, housing, firewood
- Suitability of third party certification systems and the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators for reflecting tribal perspectives of forest health and sustainability
- Indian responses to the Endangered Species Act
- How tribes view forest certification programs

Indian lands are legally different from public or private ownerships.

- Why they are legally different
- Tribal self-determination: its basis and status
- Reconciling tribal sovereignty, trust responsibility and federal environmental law: Case Study, Secretarial Order 3206
- The consultation process: tribal rights and influences on landscape scale forest management

Tribal relationships with the federal government

- How tribal forestry differs from federal forestry – and why our federal government has begun to emulate tribal forestry programs
- Why the federal government is responsible for funding tribal forestry programs
- The BIA relationship: Its basis and status USFS, BLM and EPA programs

Balancing sustainability and the pressing need for jobs

- The Harvard studies
- Marketing tribal timber: a different kind of certification label?
- Challenges for Tribal investment in new wood processing infrastructure

The Tribal Forest Protection Act

- Lessons learned at Rodeo-Chediski
- Opportunities in stewardship contracting: the fire dispatch model
- Indian fire fighting crews
- Smokey Bear and the Mescalero Apache

Ecological conditions on tribal forestlands

- IFMAT-II: The second decadal independent assessment of the Status of Indian forests and forestry, including funding comparators for tribal forest management
- Age class diversity
- Wildlife habitats
- Impact of wildfires, insects and diseases
- Growth, harvest, mortality and reforestation
- Status of integrated forest management plans

Program reports and statistics

- Administration (Funding and position analysis?)
- Status of Management planning and inventory analysis
- Forest development
- Economic development
- Woodlands
- Timber sales

- Fire management
- Pest management
- Staffing patterns in Indian forestry (tribal v BIA, Indian involvement, and tribal enrollment in Natural Resource professions)
- Alaska Native forestry

Summary Statistics by Region

ATTACHMENT D. SOUTHERN ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINABLE FORESTS FALL UPDATE

The Southern Roundtable on Sustainable Forests (SRSF) has been proceeding along its path towards better understanding the opportunities and challenges for sustainable forest and resource management in the Southern U.S. To this end, earlier this summer the group ran a “Request for Proposals” (RFP) to encourage stakeholders to form and lead “working groups.” These working groups will begin addressing issues and sub-regional areas that were identified as important at the November 2003 workshop of the SRSF. Three main initial focus areas for the groups were drawn from participant suggestions, including: the Southern Appalachians, the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley, and Non-Industrial Private Forest Landowners and Incentives. A fourth topic area was added to begin engaging the Native American forest landholders in the South and to supplement a larger national effort to define forest sustainability on tribal lands. The RFP was distributed to over 100 organizations and individuals throughout the South. While no proposals were received for the LMAV, the proposals we received for the other topic areas were all of very high caliber and had sound methods and excellent goals. The SRSF would like to thank all of you who took an interest in this RFP and hope that you will work with those groups that have been selected and that you will continue to pursue forest sustainability goals.

Proposal awards are as follows:

- **Southern Appalachians:** Land of Sky Regional Council and the Southern Appalachian Man and Biosphere Program
- **Non-Industrial Private Landowners and Incentives:** The Southern Environmental Law Center and Environmental Defense; the Southern Group of State Foresters
- **Tribal Forest Sustainability:** The Eastern Band of the Cherokee Nation

If you would like more information about the RFP selection process or about the selected proposals, please contact Jennifer Hayes at 828-257-4207.

Other News

What’s Happening with our Members?

- The Southern Appalachian Man and Biosphere Program (SAMAB) is hosting its 15th Annual Fall Conference November 16-18, 2004.
- Citizen Environment Monitoring in Appalachia Conference is being held November 4-6 in Bristol, VA.

CONGRATULATIONS TO:

- The Southern Group of State Foresters
- The Southern Environmental Law Center
- The Southern Appalachian Man & Biosphere Program
- The Eastern Band of the Cherokee Nation
- Land of Sky Regional Council and
- Environmental Defense

For submitting successful proposals!

Roundtable on Sustainable Forests

The National Roundtable on Sustainable Forests met in Denver this past May to discuss the results and participant perceptions of the regional workshops. Many of the Southern Roundtable participants took part in this “participant perceptions” survey, which was designed to help inform the national and regional

RSFs on how to best continue their efforts. The SRSFs would like to thank workshop participants Bill Hubbard (Southern Region Extension Forestry), Lark Hayes (Southern Environmental Law Center), Robb Turner (SAMAB), and Kaarsten Turner-Dalby (The Forestland Group) for representing the Southern Roundtable at this event. For more information about the May Roundtable Discussions please visit <http://www.sustainableforests.net/new.php>.

SAVE THE DATE

The next meeting of the Southern Roundtable on Sustainable Forests will be held during the week of **September 12-16, 2005** at a location TBD.

The meeting will cover:

- The results of the “working groups”
- A presentation of the “Crosswalk Report” between the Southern Forest Resource Assessment and the Montreal Process Criteria and Indicators;
- Will begin the evaluation and development of a regional set of core indicators of forest sustainability;
- Possible Poster Sessions
- And much more

Southern Roundtable on Sustainable Forest Steering Committee members include:

- Land of Sky Regional Council
- The Southern Environmental Law Center
- Auburn University
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- Southern Forest Research Partnership
- Southern Federation of Cooperatives
- Southern Appalachian Man and Biosphere Program
- National Wild Turkey Federation
- Southern Region Extension Forestry
- USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station
- Texas A&M University
- Home Depot
- Weyerhaeuser
- The Forestland Group
- The National Woodland Owners Association and
- North Carolina State University

The Summary Document, as well as links to the presentations given at the First Workshop of the Southern Roundtable on Sustainable Forests are available at www.sustainableforests.net under the “What’s New” link. Information on the other regional efforts can also be found on this website.

For more information on the Southern Roundtable on Sustainable Forests please contact Jennifer Hayes at 828-257-4207 or by email at jenniferhayes@fs.fed.us.

ATTACHMENT E. WESTERN REGIONAL AND TRIBAL UPDATES

Development of Indicators for Sustainable Management of Cultural Resources

This is a proposal to develop methods for describing the condition of areas managed for cultural resources on the Yakama Reservation. The results can be used to provide feedback for the Yakama Nation's forest management planning process. In addition, it is anticipated that the methods developed could be used on other Indian reservations as well as public lands. The primary objective is to develop quantitative and qualitative indicators for assessing the effectiveness of Yakama Nation land management policies and practices in protecting and managing cultural resources.

The Montréal Process Criteria and Indicators include seven criteria and 67 indicators that provide a framework for forest management planning, monitoring and evaluation at multiple scales. While most of the indicators are intended for comparing forest management at international and national levels, many are relevant at regional and local levels.

The seven criteria listed below are categories of capacities or processes that are essential to sustainable forest management. The 67 indicators are repeated observations of natural and social phenomena that can be used to evaluate progress toward sustainability.

Montréal Process Criteria		Number of Indicators
1.	Conservation of biological diversity	9
2.	Maintenance of productive capacity of forest ecosystem	5
3.	Maintenance of forest ecosystem health	3
4.	Conservation and maintenance of soil and water resources	8
5.	Maintenance of forest contribution to global carbon cycles	3
6.	Maintenance and enhancement of long-term multiple socio-economic benefits to meet the needs of society	19
7.	Legal, institutional and economic framework for forest conservation and sustainable management	20

There is a need to further develop indicators for the protection and management of cultural resources. Criterion 6 deals with the maintenance and enhancement of long-term multiple socio-economic benefits to meet the needs of societies. Currently, only Indicator 42 addresses cultural, social and spiritual needs and values. Indicator 42 measures sustainability in terms of area and percent of forestland managed to protect the range of cultural, social and spiritual needs and values, in relation to the total area of forestland.

Indicator 42 provides a means of obtaining a quantitative assessment of the amount of area that is managed for cultural resources; however, a qualitative assessment is needed to determine how well the management goals and objectives for these valued areas are being achieved.

Places within the Closed Area of the Yakama Reservation that are managed for cultural resources include:

- historic cattle camps, such as Beauty Camp and Buck Camp
- traditional campsites, such as Mt. Adams Lake and Camp Chaparral
- food and medicinal plant gathering places, including:
 - o wet meadows, such as Hussey Meadow, Polo Field and McCormick Meadow

- o dry meadows, such as Piscoe Meadow, Camas Flat Meadow and Starvation Flat Meadow
- o huckleberry fields and
- o bitterroot grounds
- hunting and fishing places
- vision quest places; and
- spiritual places.

Expected Future Conditions and Outputs

It is expected that the culture, traditions and practices will remain in the personal, social, economic, spiritual and political aspect of the lives of the Yakama Nation’s membership.

Proposed Methods

A qualitative assessment is needed to determine how well the goals and objectives for managing areas of cultural significance are being met.

Personnel

The Principal Investigator for this project will be a Yakama Nation member working under the supervision of the Deputy Director of the Department of Natural Resources. Additional personnel from the Yakama Nation Department of Natural Resources and the Yakama Agency Branch of Forestry will provide in-kind assistance. Yakama Nation and Bureau of Indian Affairs offices, equipment and vehicles will be used during the project.

Yakama Nation elders will be consulted on their assessment of past and current conditions, and the desired future condition of the traditional use areas.

Monitoring of Resource Management Activities

Ten percent of the resource management activities (forest, range and watershed) and other relevant actions (e.g., rights-of-way, recreation) will be reviewed to evaluate documentation regarding cultural resource values and decisions in light of requirements, policy and management directions in the Forest Management Plan.

Field evaluations will be conducted to determine if forest management or other activities are affecting areas of cultural significance. The following condition classes will be used for the qualitative assessment of each area:

1. Acceptable
2. Acceptable but requires some mitigation
3. Unacceptable but can be rehabilitated
4. Unacceptable and cannot be restored

Implementation, Effectiveness and Validation Monitoring

Additional questions to be addressed will include:

- Are cultural resources being addressed in deciding whether or not to go forward with forest management activities and other actions?

- Are steps taken to adequately mitigate disturbances during resource management activities and other actions that may disturb cultural resources?
- What mechanisms have been developed to describe past landscapes and the role of humans in shaping those landscapes?
- What mechanisms have been developed to adequately protect cultural plant populations?
- Are management directions for Cultural Resources documented in the Forest Management Plan being implemented?
- Did the planned mitigation for all resource activities reduce or remove the management impacts on cultural resources?
- Are sites of religious and cultural heritage adequately protected?
- Do tribal members have access to and use of forest species, resources and places important for cultural, subsistence or economic reasons?
- Has resource management for the Reservation been in compliance with the management directions for Cultural Resources documented in the Forest Management Plan?

The results of this study are expected to provide useful input for the Yakama Nation's natural resources planning and management efforts.

Funding

This proposal and an application for Federal Assistance are being submitted to the USDA Forest Service. The amount requested for this project is \$25,000.00. The Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Yakama Nation will provide in-kind matching resources (equal to 20% of the grant amount).

Schedule

August 2004 to March 1 2006

Deliverable

Final report on methods and indicators used to assess sustainable management of cultural resources.

Background

The following information was obtained from the National Report on Sustainable Forests (<http://www2.srs.fs.fed.us/2003/2003.htm>), the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests website (<http://www.sustainableforests.net/>) and the Montreal Process website (http://www.mpci.org/home_e.html).

The 1992 Rio Earth Summit, or United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), called upon all nations to ensure sustainable development, including the management of all types of forests. The summit produced a Statement of Forest Principles, conventions on biodiversity, climate change and desertification, and a plan of action for the 21st century called Agenda 21, all of which have implications for forest management.

Building on the Statement of Forest Principles, various groups of countries joined together to discuss and determine ways to assess progress toward sustainable forest management. There are now nine ongoing

international Criteria and Indicators processes, involving approximately 150 countries. The USA is a participant in the Montréal Process Criteria and Indicators process.

In 1993, Canada convened an International Seminar of Experts on Sustainable Development of Boreal and Temperate Forests. The seminar was held in Montréal and was sponsored by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The seminar focused specifically on criteria and indicators and how they could be used to define and measure progress towards sustainable development of forests. The European countries decided to work as a region under the framework of the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe and the Helsinki, or Pan-European, Process.

Subsequently, an initiative was launched among non-European temperate and boreal countries to develop and implement internationally agreed-upon criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management. The Montréal Process began in June 1994, in Geneva, Switzerland, with the first meeting of the Working Group on Criteria and Indicators for the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Temperate and Boreal Forests. Montréal Process members include the following twelve countries on five continents: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Russian Federation, United States of America and Uruguay. These countries account for:

- 90% of the world's temperate and boreal forests
- 60% of all forests on Earth
- 35% of the world's population; and
- 45% of world trade in wood and wood products.

In February 1995, the Montréal Process countries, meeting in Santiago, Chile, issued a declaration containing a comprehensive set of seven national-level criteria and 67 indicators to guide policymakers, forest managers and the general public in the conservation and sustainable management of temperate and boreal forests. The Santiago Declaration provides a framework for the Montréal Process countries to begin moving toward implementing the sustainable forest management principles agreed to in Rio.

ATTACHMENT F. WESTERN FORESTRY LEADERSHIP COALITION (WFLC) PROPOSAL FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT IN THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER SUB-BASINS, DATED 10/28/2004

Background

There is an exciting opportunity for eight of the WFLC states to become involved in a significant effort that will not only benefit individual states, and the WFLC but also the nation to help protect and manage our nation's watershed.

The USDA Forest Service, in collaboration with the Roundtable on Sustainable Forests and National Association of State Foresters, has begun efforts to improve water quality in the Upper Mississippi and Lower Mississippi basins. These efforts are part of a larger partnership known as the *White Water to Blue Water* (WW2BW) Partnership Initiative, with an initial global focus of the Wider Caribbean Region. WW2BW, launched at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in September 2002, promotes integrating the management of watersheds, coasts, and oceans. There are four themes of sustainability within WW2BW, they are: marine-ecosystem-based management, sustainable tourism, environmentally sound marine transportation, and integrated watershed management. The last theme is what the USDA is helping coordinate and is relative specifically to the WFLC. The State Department and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) are the leading U.S. Government agencies involved in WW2BW. More information about the overall partnership effort, as well as projects underway, at can be found at <http://www.ww2bw.org>.

Why the Mississippi River Basin?

The overall goal of WW2BW is to restore damaged aquatic ecosystems in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. The Northeast Area and the South have taken this effort on in a big way and they have already made progress in those areas. This effort is most challenging due to the impact of land-based activities in this area. The domestic link to the WW2BW projects is the Mississippi River Basin. Therefore, enhancing sustainable forest and resource management on the upstream landscape, encompassing the Mississippi River Basin and its six major sub-basins, is key to achieving this goal.

In the West, areas of interest include the Missouri and the Arkansas-Red-White River sub-basins. Resource management practices of interest would be all that influence water quality including: forest management, range management, agriculture, water management, and minerals management, all of which fall into the four existing sustainable resource roundtables—forests, rangelands, minerals, and water. The range of activities would include: alpine and forest systems in the headwaters, rangeland systems in mid-reaches, agro-forest and riparian systems. Within each system a variety of management activities is possible, including urban and community forestry in small communities as well as large cities.

Proposal to the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition (WFLC)

The WFLC is uniquely positioned to help lead a western contribution in improving the quality of water in the two western major sub-basins affecting the Mississippi River Basin. The single largest benefit to the states and affected regions would be increased partnership opportunities to meet state priorities. Participation in these efforts will also:

1. Address a priority WFLC issue: Watershed Management.
2. Position western plains states to better meet their watershed/quality needs and priorities

3. Make states more competitive for limited federal dollars.
4. Compliment a national project, bringing cooperation between areas (Northeast/South/West)
5. Secure possible additional funding for participating, not only from within the Forest Service, but from other agencies such as EPA as well for sustainable forestry projects.

This proposal is for the WFLC members and staff to explore how they can become part of this partnership and these very important efforts. These efforts require multi-state collaboration; the problems and solutions cross biological, geographical and political landscapes. Involved are real-time global concerns whose solutions require the attention of the forest and range management community. Tackling these issues engages all seven criteria of sustainable forest management as well as the environmental, social, and economic indicators of sustainability. This effort also ties into work by the states of the Northeastern Area and Region 8 that is beginning in the upper (northern) and the lower (southern) Mississippi Basin, thus applying a sustainability approach linking land and water systems in the entire watershed. Participation by the eight western states in this watershed would enable a system-wide approach. Western states and Forest Service Regions within each of the two major sub-basins include:

- Missouri Sub-Basin: Montana and North Dakota in Region 1, Wyoming, Colorado, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas in Region 2.
- Arkansas-Red-White Sub-Basin: Colorado and Kansas in Region 2, and New Mexico In Region 3.

First Steps

The WFLC suggests, as a starting point for the WFLC staff to seek the input of the Agroforestry community, the 8 state foresters and representatives from their respective Forest Service Regions to pull a task force together to discuss the proposal then if appropriate support an effort to organize a workshop. Funds for this workshop could be available from the Forest Service Washington Office. Participants at the workshop would explore the nature and range of issues, to understand how the sustainability model can serve as an organizing framework for action, and to learn what approaches are being undertaken in other regions of the river basin. The outcome would be a prospectus for a suite of activities that could be sponsored/endorsed/undertaken by the WFLC as a participant in the WW2BW Partnership Initiative. The proposed suite of activities could be used by the Forest Service Washington Office for many purposes, such as: to help focus national funds on regional activities in the West, follow-on activities to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, as well as mutually supporting national and regional goals related to sustainable forest and resource management.

ATTACHMENT G. DESCRIPTION OF PLANS AND ACTIVITIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 (DRAFT DATED NOVEMBER 4, 2004).

Introduction

The Roundtable on Sustainable Forests (Roundtable) is an open and inclusive multi-stakeholder process dedicated to shared leadership and responsibility toward the goal of sustainable forest management (SFM) on public and private forestlands in the U.S. Since its inception in 1999, the Roundtable focused its attention primarily on identifying and evaluating data that could be used to assess the state of the nation's forests and providing input to the federal government on the production of the *National Report on Sustainable Forests – 2003*. The *National Report*, which was published in February 2004, is the most comprehensive assessment to date of SFM in the U.S. and serves as a benchmark for future assessments, as well as a basis for improved understanding and decision-making.

The publication of the *National Report* creates an important opportunity for U.S. forest stakeholders to discern meaning from the information contained in the *National Report*, and to provide targeted feedback to U.S. Government participants in the Montreal Process Working Group as they begin to discuss refinements to the Montreal Process Criteria & Indicators (C&I). This version of the Roundtable Plans and activities for fiscal year 2005 is updated to reflect our best understanding of the milestones and timeframes of the international process that were discussed at the recent meeting of the Montreal Process Working Group (MPWG) on September 29, 2004 in Jasper, Alberta Canada.

In fiscal year 2005 (October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005), the Roundtable will conduct activities designed to take advantage of these opportunities and to continue to build broad stakeholder awareness and support for sustainable forests. Specifically, the Roundtable plans to conduct its next meeting on November 17, 2004, at which it will agree on plans and activities for the Roundtable in 2005, including discussion on a process for developing a U.S. proposal for refining the Montreal Process indicators. This meeting will be preceded by a workshop on November 16, 2004 that will focus on the work of the Integration and Synthesis Group (ISG). In May 2005, the Roundtable will conduct a national workshop that will focus on the results of Multiple Perspectives Project, the ISG, and the activities undertaken to solicit stakeholder feedback on the U.S proposals for Montreal Process indicator refinements. All of these activities are described below.

Multiple Perspectives Project

Over the course of several meetings and feedback sessions, Roundtable participants have developed and endorsed the Multiple Perspectives Project. The Project's primary purpose is to invite members of the forest stakeholder community to share their views of what they discern to be the key findings that flow from the data contained in the *National Report*. By doing so, the project also aims to explore key refinements in the Montreal Process C&I, data gaps that impede understanding, and the theories, concepts, and experiences that stakeholders from different perspectives use as the basis for their analysis.

The Roundtable released a call for manuscript proposals and instructions to authors on August 31, 2004. A Review Committee will select approximately ten proposals for development into full papers by mid-November 2004 and has set a deadline of March 31, 2005 for receipt of those papers. The May 2005 national workshop will provide an initial opportunity to use the papers as a platform and basis for stakeholder dialogue and exchange. In addition, at this workshop the Roundtable intends to launch an on-line dialogue process that will continue through the summer of 2005, and, depending on the availability of funding, may culminate in a workshop in fall 2005, coinciding with the formal publication of the final

papers by the Society of American Foresters. The Multiple Perspectives Project will stimulate and capture the thinking of many forest stakeholders about the meaning of the data contained in the 2003 *National Report* and on how to make the Montreal Process C&I a more useful reporting framework. It will also provide valuable input for the planning of future *National Reports* and for influencing the future direction of the Roundtable process by identifying key issues that should be addressed through multi-stakeholder dialogue. For more information on this project, see the [What's New](#) section of the Roundtable website.

Integration and Synthesis Group (ISG)

The ISG was convened by the Roundtable Network in October 2003 for the purpose of developing a shared conceptual framework to tie together sustainability criteria and indicators being utilized or developed by the forest, rangeland, water, and minerals and energy roundtables. Its participants include representatives from all four roundtables with a mix of expertise, including systems ecologists, economists, and sociologists, as well as individuals from other disciplines and backgrounds. The ISG's work contributes to the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) effort to develop a national system of environmental and natural resource indicators. More about the ISG is available at: http://roundtablenetwork.cnr.colostate.edu/Conceptual_Modeling_Info/.

The ISG's current focus is the development of a multi-tiered, systems-based conceptual framework that can provide a basis for a national system of environmental and natural resource indicators and a context within which sector-specific indicators can fit. This work is anticipated to have implications for a new, more unified approach to developing and using indicators that cross resource boundaries and interests. It is hoped that the conceptual framework can create a common, shared basis upon which the four resource roundtables can jointly improve understanding natural resource sustainability. The ISG work product will be reviewed and discussed by participants in all four roundtables. The Roundtable will convene a workshop on November 16, 2004 to provide input and further develop the conceptual framework. The results of the workshop will be presented at the November 17, 2004 Roundtable meeting. The ISG will continue to refine its conceptual framework throughout fiscal year 2005, including a presentation at the national May 2005 Roundtable workshop.

Ongoing Regional and Tribal Activities

The Roundtable will continue to support new and ongoing regional and Tribal dialogues on SFM, though it will not play the direct organizing role that characterized much of its efforts during fiscal year 2004. Upon request, the Roundtable will advertise regional events and opportunities by making its web site available for posting announcements and meeting materials, showcase regional and Tribal dialogues at Roundtable meetings, and otherwise mobilize its network of forest stakeholders to assist and contribute in an appropriate manner that supports but does not attempt to supercede regional/local leadership at those levels. The Roundtable will also continue to provide travel assistance to regional and Tribal stakeholders who wish to bring their perspectives to the various activities mentioned earlier in this work plan. Finally, the Roundtable will serve as a vehicle for communicating the results of regional dialogues to forest stakeholders at the national and international levels, so that the results of regional efforts better inform the work of people working on SFM at those levels.

National Roundtable Workshop: May 11-13, 2005

The Roundtable will conduct a national workshop May 11-13, 2005 that will draw on the other efforts described above. The workshop will focus on: progress on the Multiple Perspectives Project and the ISG, and on how these and other potential efforts, such as those suggested below, inform the process of refining the Montreal Process indicators.

Other Indicator Refinement Preparatory Activities

The international process to refine the Montreal Process indicators was recently decided at a meeting of the Montreal Process Working Group (MPWG) in Jasper, Alberta, in October 2004. A key Roundtable activity for FY2005 is to assist the U.S. Government in obtaining input from U.S. stakeholders and technical experts on potential indicator refinements that can be used by the U.S. delegations attending the Montreal Process Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting in October 2005 and the MPWG meeting in February 2006. Each of the activities described previously in this document is designed in part to solicit such feedback. However, additional activities to obtain input will be required in preparation for the Roundtable's May 2005 workshop (described above). Some options for these activities and an approximate timeframe for their implementation could be:

- **January 2005 – A workshop on the Montreal Process indicators.** A broad cross-section of forest stakeholders from across the country would have the opportunity to comment on whether and how effectively the current indicators measure the biological, social, economic, and institutional aspects of forests, and where there is need to change these indicators in order to better understand important trends regarding forests.
- **February through April 2005 – Three workshops on the Montreal Process indicator refinements.** USDA Forest Service leaders in sustainability from three different regions of the country would each sponsor a workshop on refinements to the Montreal Process indicators. Participants would be drawn regionally and nationally from different levels of governmental organizations, academia and other research organizations, and non-governmental organizations representing different scales of indicator application. *National Report* Criterion Lead Authors (or their designee) would lead the discussion. The workshops would focus on developing indicator refinements based on stakeholder input, new knowledge and expertise. Refinements might include new indicator wording and related modifications to the rationale and interpretation of the indicator. The results of this refinement process will be presented as part of the national Roundtable workshop in May 2005 for additional stakeholder input.

The events described above are ideas for activities that could meet the objective of obtaining high quality input from a diverse set of stakeholders on whether and how to best refine the Montreal C&I. In order to further shape these or other potential options for obtaining stakeholder input on the Montreal Process indicators, at its November 17 meeting the Roundtable may elect to form a multi-stakeholder Planning Team to take on the task of determining what activities should be undertaken under the auspices of the Roundtable, and within the constraints of available resources, to accomplish this objective.

Summary and Conclusion

The activities described above focus on discerning meaning and catalyzing multi-stakeholder dialogue on the content of the *National Report*, connecting the C&I to policies, programs, and activities by means such as the regional and Tribal efforts, and creating a shared conceptual framework with other natural resource sustainability efforts. The May 11-13, 2005 national Roundtable workshop will be the culmination and integration of the activities above, all of which contribute to the ongoing stakeholder dialogue on sustainable forests and inform the U.S. efforts to improve and refine the Montreal Process indicators. Whether, how, and when additional input beyond that obtained at the May 2005 workshop might be needed are questions that the Roundtable will need to address during the preparation for and follow up to the May 2005 workshop. Such additional efforts would also be contingent upon the availability of resources.